

slowly. In addition to the usual provision, Rs. 20,000 were sanctioned for the current year for equipment, and that amount has been fully utilised. For the next year, due to financial considerations, Government found it possible to sanction only Rs. 15,000. As grants are given, equipment will also improve.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMI.—The answer to question (c) does not include the hospital which was recently opened at Krishnarajanagar. May I know the reason for that omission?

MR. S. SUBBA RAO.—There is a clerical mistake in that respect. In fact three hospitals have been omitted in the list (1) Krishnarajanagar Female Dispensary and Maternity, (2) Kolar Mission Hospital, and (3) Mandagadde Mission Hospital, so that the total number of institutions should be 29 and not 26.

MR. T. RAMACHANDRA.—Is there any possibility of opening some more maternity homes and female dispensaries out of the Silver Jubilee Fund?

MR. S. SUBBA RAO.—It is not yet settled as to how the Silver Jubilee collections are to be utilized.

MR. GURUSWAMI GOWDA.—If private donations are forthcoming, will the department be pleased to accept them and open more hospitals?

MR. S. SUBBA RAO.—Yes, provided the local bodies concerned undertake to bear their portion of the cost.

High Schools for Girls.

Dharmapara SRI. ALAMMA
(Women's Interests).—

Q.—52. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) The number of girls studying in the high schools each year during the past ten years?

(b) Whether it is a fact that the number of such students is dwindling every year and whether Government have tried to find out the reasons for the same?

THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT (MR. H. V. RAMASWAMI).—

A.—(a)

Year	Strength
1924-25	... 229

Year	Strength
1925-26	... 257
1926-27	... 265
1927-28	... 243
1928-29	... 277
1929-30	... 328
1930-31	... 363
1931-32	... 407
1932-33	... 474
1933-34	... 472

(b) In the light of the above, the question does not arise.

SRI. K. D. RUKMINIAMMA.—It is seen from the answer that the number of girls studying in the high schools has increased twofold. Is that due to a corresponding increase in the number of high schools?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION (MR. N. S. SUBBA RAO).—The number of high schools also has increased from 3 to 6.

MRS. KAMALAMMA H. DASAPPA.—Does it not show that with the increase in the number of schools, women's education will increase correspondingly?

MR. N. S. SUBBA RAO.—Obviously.

REPRESENTATIONS.—(contd.).

REPRESENTATION No. 2.

Reduction of land assessment by 25 per cent.

MESSRS. D. Y. SIDDAPPA, Tumkur Municipality, and K. NARAYANA SETTY, Tumkur Taluk.

MR. DESADA YEJAMAN SIDDAPPA represented that as the raiyats had been put to much loss and hardship on account of failure of crops in the State, land assessment should be reduced by 25 per cent.

It was agreed that this representation be considered in connection with Resolution No. 2 on the same subject.

REPRESENTATION No. 3.

Reduction of rates of assessment in the Bangalore District.

MESSRS. VEERE GOWDA, Doddballapur Taluk; T. MADIAH GOWDA and V. VENKATAPPA, Channarayana Taluk; R. DASAPPA, Devanahalli Taluk; A. M. VENKATASAMIAH, Closepet Municipality; H. GANGAPPA, Magadi Taluk; SHROFF RANGASAMI SETTY, Magadi Municipality; S. KARIAPPA and M. LINGE GOWDA, Kankanhalli Taluk; GURUSWAMI GOWDA, Hoskote Taluk; M. B. GURULINGIAH, Closepet Taluk; S. T. MALLASETTAPPA, Nelamangala Taluk and M. S. PUTTARAMASETTI, Magadi Taluk.

MR. VEERE GOWDA represented that the rates of assessment prevailing in the Bangalore District were very much higher than those prevailing in British India and quoted figures in support of this statement. He also quoted figures to show that the cost of cultivation *plus* assessment payable was 'much more than the price realised by the cultivator. The hardship was being felt more particularly during recent years on account of seasonal and market conditions. For these reasons he prayed that the assessment be reduced.

MR. GURUSWAMI GOWDA also represented that in the purely agricultural and maidan district of Bangalore, agriculturists were experiencing considerable hardship in paying the heavy rates of land revenue that were at present prevailing. He was glad that so many representations were being made by representatives of the Kolar District and that Government were lending a sympathetic ear to such representations. But he would invite the attention of the Government to the fact that the rates prevailing in the Bangalore District were as high as those in the Kolar District so that the special measures of relief that were granted to the Kolar District were equally deserved by the Bangalore District also.

ANOTHER MEMBER brought to notice that the rates were very high not only under land revenue but under Record of Rights fees, mohatarfa and various other levies. This grievance, he said, had no particular reference to any district and suggested that a uniform reduction of assessment was called for throughout the State.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER (MR. N. MADHAVA RAO) stated in reply that it was usual for representatives of the maidan districts to say that those districts deserved special relief and for the representatives of the malnad districts to say that malnad deserved special relief.

REPRESENTATION No 4.

Reduction of assessment.

MESSRS. A. G. MUDDURACHAPPA, Bowringpet Municipality; B. SRINIVASA RAO, Bowring-

pet Taluk and all the other members of the Kolar District.

MR. B. SRINIVASA RAO represented that the dry and wet lands in which the raiyats had sunk wells at heavy cost had been classified by the Government as *dry bagayet* and *wet bagayet* and had increased the assessment on such lands. He added that in addition to the levy of bagayet rates in view of improvements effected at the raiyats' own cost, there was yet another grievance, *viz.*, that once the lands were classified as bagayet, raiyats were denied even the benefit of remissions in cases of necessity. He therefore represented that wherever the rates had been raised in view of improvements effected at the owner's own cost, they should be restored to the original level.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY observed that this was a very important matter though by no means engaging the attention of the House for the first time on this occasion. He added that, according to the Land Revenue Code as well as the Land Revenue Rules, the very principle of taxing a raiyat for improvements effected by himself was wrong and that it was altogether unjustifiable for Government to levy bagayet rates in view of such improvements.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) doubted whether there was an enhancement of rates purely on account of such improvements.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY replied that there were any number of instances of the kind in all parts of the State. The increased rates had been given effect to in connection with re-settlements.

THE DIRECTOR OF LAND RECORDS (MR. G. B. HEBLIKAR) explained that things were not so bad as were being depicted. At the time of re-settlement, reduction of rates had been effected in any number of cases. Taking the Kolar District itself, for example, he said that the previous re-settlement had resulted in a reduction of garden assessment by 16 per cent in Gudibanda Taluk and by 11 per cent in and around Chikballapur.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY interjected that bagayet rates were on the whole reduced, but not in each case. Individual cases of grievances, however, were quite a legion.

MR. G. B. HEBLIKAR replied that the question of individual cases was quite different. So far as the general question was concerned, it was necessary to remember that even though the term *bagayet assessment* was employed, the maximum bagayet rates prescribed had never been levied in any case. He also said that in Malur, bagayet rates had been reduced by as much as 28 per cent. It would therefore be inaccurate to say that in all cases re-settlement had resulted in substantial increase of assessment or that private improvements were taxed. There was almost always a decrease in garden assessment and in the case of *motasthal* (i.e., lift or well irrigated) lands, the principles laid down in the Government Orders of 1902 and 1918 were scrupulously followed with the result that the well-irrigated garden assessment did not exceed the sanctioned dry rates. The avowed policy of the department was and has always been not to tax improvements made by private capital unless advantage was taken of water belonging to or made available by Government.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY however pressed the question of principle involved in raising the assessment in view of improvements effected to the land at the cost of the owners, and wanted that Government should recognise that such improvements ought not to result in enhancement of assessment.

MR. K. MATTHAN stated that Government agreed in principle that results of individual efforts should not be taxed unless it be that for effecting those improvements sources of water belonging to Government had been drawn upon.

REPRESENTATION No. 5.

Reduction in the rate of bagayet assessment.

MR. S. SORAPPA and the other members of the Sira Taluk.

MR. S. SORAPPA represented that during re-survey, certain wet lands

which were dependent on tanks and certain dry lands which were dependent on rain were classed as garden lands and garden rates of assessment were levied on such lands, though no perennial garden crops were raised thereon, on the ground that those lands contained private wells sunk by the owners after original survey. This practice was not prevalent in the Madras Presidency. He prayed that the same concession be shown here also and the increased rate of garden *kandayam* be reduced and necessary alterations made in the survey records.

MR. K. P. CHANNABASAPPA brought to notice that simply because wells were sunk by land-owners or cultivators, the Survey Department enhanced the assessment on such lands. This in itself was wrong in principle. But there was yet another grievance so far as the agriculturists were concerned. Whether the wells in question contained water or not, the assessment once raised would continue to be levied and this, he said, was working as a great hardship.

THE DIRECTOR OF LAND RECORDS (MR. G. B. HEBLIKAR) observed that the answer given to the previous representation applied to this case also.

REPRESENTATION No. 6.

Reduction of assessment.

MR. M. RAME GOWDA, Chintamani Taluk and all the other members of the Kolar District.

MR. M. RAME GOWDA represented that in the Kolar District the assessment was abnormally heavy as compared with that levied in other districts. Though representations were made many a time to reduce the assessment, no redress was given upto the present day. He prayed that the rate of assessment be reduced in view of the fact that the raiyats were passing through very difficult times just now.

MR. A. G. MUDDURACHAPPA said that this representation had special reference only to about 8 taluks of the Kolar District and about 3 taluks of the Bangalore District so that, if the request was granted, Government would not be put to any very great loss.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantra-pravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*)

replied that this representation was also contained in the address presented to the Dewan in his recent tour in the Kolar District and that he had made a suitable reply to it. Government had also passed orders to the effect that it was not practicable to grant the request in question.

REPRESENTATION No. 7.

No. 7.—Reduction of assessment.

MR. S. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA, Malur Taluk, and all the other members of the Kolar District.

MR. S. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA represented that in the Kolar District the expenditure for irrigating wet lands amounted to about Rs. 50 per acre and the return from the land by way of produce was always less than the outlay incurred and never more. Still the Government had fixed a high rate of wet assessment and it was very necessary that the *atchkat* lands of tanks that did not receive adequate supply of water be assessed to dry rate only, by remitting the water rate, as the *atchkat*-dars of the district were impoverished on account of draught and famine conditions.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantra-pravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) replied that if any portion of the *atchkat* did not at all receive water from the tank, the better course would be to remove such portion from the *atchkat* instead of showing it as wet land but levying dry rates.

MR. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA argued that the wet assessment consisted of two parts, *viz.*, dry assessment plus water rate. So long as there was no adequate supply of water, there ought to be no difficulty in withdrawing the claim in respect of water-rate.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that that was not a correct understanding of the mode of taxation in Mysore. It was not possible to point to a certain portion of the assessment as dry assessment and the other portion as water rate. Different calculations on the basis of supply or non-supply of water were not practicable. At the same time, he said that in cases where crops failed owing to failure of supply of water in tanks, Government were sanctioning a

remission of half the assessment under certain conditions.

MR. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA said that remissions had no reference to the local and other cesses payable, so that in the net result the so-called half remission was not of much benefit to individual *khatedars*.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY spoke in favour of the representation. He added that the rules of remission in Mysore were very stringent. Personally he thought that the Madras principle would be more favourable to the raiyats, *viz.*, levy of assessment with reference to the number of crops raised, so that in cases where crops altogether failed, no assessment would have to be paid but only the cesses. The system of averages followed in Mysore under the settlement procedure was not at all helping the Mysore agriculturist, and till that was suitably modified it was necessary to grant the request under consideration.

MR. K. MATTHAN doubted how far the agriculturists in all parts of the State would support the adoption of the Madras rule.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY hoped that he was voicing the opinion of the Mysore agriculturists in general in making that suggestion. Even granting that the suggestion did not find universal expression, there was nothing to prevent the Government to examine it on merits.

Secondly, he referred to the report of the committee appointed to recommend suitable measures of relief to agriculturists in the State. That committee had recommended that only dry rates of assessment be collected in all cases where crops had failed. That was, he said, a majority recommendation and all the official members of the committee had also granted that there was some force in that proposal. Yet, the Government had not passed orders accepting the suggestion. He hoped that at least before the next collection season set in, Government would have accepted it.

MR. K. MATTHAN observed that the recommendation referred to was to the effect that either half the assessment

or the maximum dry rate, whichever was less, be levied. Government would examine it. As regards the adoption of the system in force in Madras, he observed that it was not possible to decide immediately whether or not that system could be adopted straightway. The question might be deferred for consideration in connection with the next re-settlement operations.

MR. CHENGALARAYA REDDY then represented that in case the Government would like to have more time for considering the general question, they might at least announce relief on the lines suggested with particular reference to the current year.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that the Government were disposed to the view that for the sake of one particular year, it was inexpedient to change the rules. Government, as stated already, were considering the general question and would pass orders as soon as possible.

REPRESENTATION No. 8.

Reduction of assessment.

MR. R. P. RAJANNA, Goribidnur Taluk and all the other members of the Kolar District.

MR. R. P. RAJANNA prayed that when a tank did not receive adequate supply of water each wet or garden land below it should be given remission, with reference to the extent which could not be cultivated with wet or garden crop, each survey number being regarded as the unit for ascertaining the proportion of crop realized and the extent of relief to be given.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantra-pravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN) enquired whether there were any cases in which remissions were refused on the ground that the lands in question did not form entire survey numbers.

MESSRS. RAJANNA and K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY said that there were many instances of that kind.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that if that were so, Government would look into the question. He was inclined to feel that there was no reason why remissions should not be given in such cases also.

MR. BELUR SRINIVASIENGAR enquired whether the orders that the Government might issue to that effect would

have reference to the current year's collections also.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied in the affirmative.

MR. RAJANNA then brought to notice that even in cases where remissions had been sanctioned by higher officers the Amildars were not giving effect to such orders by communicating them to the village officers concerned but were proceeding with coercive measures. He observed that this was due to the fact that the Amildars were anxious to show a high percentage of collections.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER (MR. N. MADHAVA RAO) remarked that the member was making a serious charge against local officers. He did not believe that any officer was interested in not giving effect to any relief actually ordered, and he felt that, if at all, the local officers would only be too anxious to give effect to such orders because they would then be able to show, with the same collections, a still higher percentage of collections, since the demand itself would get reduced to the extent that remissions were sanctioned.

REPRESENTATION No. 9.

Granting remission of assessment in the taluks of Shikarpur, Sorab, Shimoga and Channagiri on account of failure of crops.

MESSRS. SURANGI SIDDABASAPPA and V. VEERABASAPPA, Shikarpur Taluk.

MR. SURANGI SIDDABASAPPA prayed that on account of the failure of crops due to insufficiency of rains in the Shimoga, Channagiri, Sorab and Shikarpur Taluks during the current year, remission of assessment be sanctioned either in whole or in part in the villages in which there was a failure of crops, after a detailed examination of the *pahani* accounts.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER (MR. N. MADHAVA RAO) replied that in all clear cases, orders had been passed already. Some cases in which investigation was necessary were however pending and they would also be disposed of very soon.

MR. V. V. IYER brought to notice that in respect of several villages in the Shimoga District proposals had been submitted for removing some lands from

atchkats of tanks and declaring them as dry lands.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantra-pravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) replied that the proposals were under examination.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMI enquired whether collections would be stayed till orders were passed on those proposals.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that that was a matter to be left to the judgment of the local officers concerned. The Deputy Commissioner concerned had the discretion to suspend collections in cases where such recommendations were made.

MR. U. VEERABASAPPA represented that in some cases wet crops were usually being raised with the help of rain water alone. During the current year, due to failure of rains, the crops had failed in all such cases and remissions had been recommended in respect of them. Still the local officers were taking coercive steps and even the movables of the landowners in question were being attached. He therefore requested that coercive steps be ordered to be stayed until orders were passed on the remission proposals and that the Government should also try to expedite their orders.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that that representation would be sympathetically considered.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH observed that the collection season was practically coming to a close so far as the current year was concerned and that agriculturists were experiencing considerable difficulty due to belated orders with regard to any concessions extended to them. If the object of remissions or suspensions was to be gained in full, it was necessary for the Government to order such relief well in advance of the collection season.

MR. K. MATTHAN said that that was the object of the Government also. But sometimes it would not be possible to order relief well in time because of belated recommendations. So far as the current year was concerned, he added that in some cases orders could not be issued earlier on account of the fact that inspections became necessary

in respect of a very large number of cases.

MR. T. MARIAPPA represented that in the Nagamangala Taluk remissions had been recommended on a large scale but the local officers had already collected the bulk of the demand as orders had not yet been received with regard to the concessions recommended.

THE DEPUTY COMMISSIONER, MYSORE DISTRICT (MR. B. T. KESHAVA IYENGAR) said that he had specially asked the Amildar of the Nagamangala Taluk not to proceed with collections in the cases referred to.

MR. MARIAPPA brought to notice that there was some difficulty for Amildars to act on oral instructions.

MR. N. MADHAVA RAO promised to issue circular instructions in the matter to all local officers.

REPRESENTATION No. 10.

Grant of remission of dry assessment for the current year in Pavagada Taluk.

MR. G. SHANKARA SETTY, Pavagada Taluk.

MR. G. SHANKARA SETTY represented that Pavagada Taluk was surrounded by British territories and as such there was similarity in the nature of soil, climate and rate of taxation in this taluk and in the neighbouring British territories. But, whereas in the British province dry assessment had been ordered to be entirely remitted in the current year owing to the complete failure of dry crops, in Pavagada the Mysore Government had ordered only suspension of half the dry assessment. As this taluk was subjected to periodical distress, the raiyats would feel it very hard to pay in the next year, in a lump, their usual assessment along with this year's suspended portion of assessment. He therefore prayed that the current year's dry assessment be completely remitted.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantra-pravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) observed that 50 per cent of the demand had been ordered to be suspended in the case of the Pavagada Taluk.

MR. SHANKARA SETTY brought to notice that that was not enough. In the surrounding British Indian province the assessment had been completely remitted

during the current year, and in addition famine relief works on a very vast scale had also been taken up. When the raiyats of those territories were enjoying such material concessions at the hands of their Government, it would be most unjust and unreasonable to expect the agriculturists in Pavagada Taluk to rest content with mere suspension and that too, to the extent of only a half of the demand. Already some persons were going out of the borders in quest of labour, and unless the demand was remitted entirely there was the risk of a very large number of landholders vacating their lands and going away into British Indian jurisdiction.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER (MR. N. MADHAVA RAO) observed that Government did not find it possible to give any concession over and above that already ordered. As regards persons going away in quest of labour, he added that he had definite information that it was not true that many had gone out from the Pavagada Taluk.

REPRESENTATION No. 11.

Levy of permanent assessment on lands under temporary cultivation in the Low Level Canal area, Krishnarajasagara.

MESSRS. H. K. MADIAH and M. K. SUBBIAH, Malvalli Taluk; SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH, Mysore Taluk; T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA, Nagamangala Taluk; S. K. SIDDE GOWDA, S. THIMME GOWDA alias THAMMAIYA GOWDA and A. LINEG GOWDA, Krishnarajpet Taluk; C. DASAPPA, Heggadadevanakote Taluk; GURUBASAPPA, Chamarajanagar Taluk; MIR RAZA ALI, Minorities; B. S. PUTTASWAMI, Nanjangud Taluk; H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA, T. Narsipur Taluk; H. HONNAIYA and M. L. LINGANNA, Mandya Taluk; PATEL SANNA MALLAPPA, Yelandur Jahagir; K. KEMPE GOWDA, Mandya Municipality; A. THAMMAYYA, Minorities; B. SIDDALINGA SETTY, Special Interests and S. C. MALLIAH, Madur Taluk.

Mr. H. K. MADIAH prayed that permanent assessment be fixed in the case of all lands commanded by the Krishnarajasagara Low Level Canal, which had been under wet cultivation for over five years, in lieu of the temporary assessment, water rate and cesses now being levied on them.

Mr. M. SUBBIAH added that the present levies were proving to be more than what the landholders would have had to pay if permanent assessment were levied.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER (MR. N. MADHAVA RAO) however did not think so. It might be so in exceptional cases, but on the average the dry rate and water rate together would not exceed wet rates.

Mr. K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA enquired why in that case permanent assessment should not be levied.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN) observed that the orders in respect of the levy of permanent assessment after temporary assessment had been levied for 5 years or more did not apply to lands under the Krishnarajasagara and other large reservoirs. It was necessary in such cases to keep the dry assessment and water rates as two distinct items. Of course, if the levy was considered to be very high in particular cases, there was nothing to prevent the Government from reducing it. At the same time he said that wherever necessary the levy might also be raised. As regards the general question of levying permanent assessment, he said that Government did not propose to depart from a practice which had been in vogue for a very long time.

ANOTHER MEMBER represented that at least in the case of lands on which only manurial crops were raised and for which water was never being supplied from Government tanks actually, the rate of assessment now levied should be reduced.

Mr. K. MATTHAN promised to look into the question of water supply to such lands.

Mr. S. C. MALLIAH said that he would have no objection if the Government consistently refused to levy permanent assessment in all the cases where temporary assessment had been first levied. But Government would not be right in levying permanent assessment in some cases and refusing to do so in others. Secondly, because temporary assessment was being collected, the local officers refused to let in water to such lands for raising hot weather supplies, even when water was available. And lastly, whenever the tanks did not receive sufficient supply, only those lands were supplied

with water in the first instance on which permanent assessment had been levied.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that so far as water supply was concerned, no distinction was sought to be made as between lands bearing permanent assessment and lands assessed temporarily. If cases of such invidious distinctions were brought to notice, Government would see that they were put an end to.

REPRESENTATION No. 12.

Introduction of Record of Rights Scheme into Sringeri Jahgir Sub-Taluk.

MR. K. SUBBA RAO, Sringeri Jahgir.

MR. K. SUBBA RAO prayed that the scheme of Record of Rights be introduced into Sringeri Jahgir Sub-Taluk.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) replied that Government would have no objection to grant the request and hoped that the Jahgirdar would co-operate with the Government in that matter.

REPRESENTATION No. 13.

Record of Rights.

MR. PATEL MUNIAPPA, Harihar Sub-Taluk.

MR. PATEL MUNIAPPA prayed that in the taluks in which the Record of Rights Scheme had been introduced, the *hisse* fees in respect of mortgages, sale deeds, etc., be ordered to be recovered from parties in the Sub-Registrar's Offices, in accordance with the procedure in vogue in Bombay.

THE DEWAN said that it was not possible for the Government to make any reply to that representation at once without further consideration.

REPRESENTATION No. 14.

Levy of *hisse* fees under the Record of Rights Regulation.

MESSRS. S. P. BRAHMAMMA, Hassan Municipality; H. B. GUNDAPPA and B. DONDE GOWDA, Hassan Taluk; MAHOMED AKBAR SHERIFF, Minorities; B. N. CHELUVU GOWDA, M. NANJAPPA and B. L. HUTCHAPPA, Channarayana Taluk; S. V. GURUMURTYACHAR, Minorities; B. M. DEVE GOWDA and B. N. BORANNA GOWDA, Belur Taluk; K. A. RAHIM, Minorities; P. BASAVE GOWDA and A. KENCHAPPA, Arsikere Taluk; KARIAPPA GOWDA and K. RAMANNA, Holenarsipur Taluk; NARASIMHAIAH, Holenarsipur Municipality; A. V. NANJUNDASSETTY and H. M. DYAVAPPA GOWDA, Arkalgud Taluk; B. K.

SOME GOWDA and DEVAPPA GOWDA, Manjarabad Taluk and A. S. NANJUNDAPPA, Alur Sub-Taluk.

MR. S. P. BRAHMAMMA represented that, according to the existing orders of Government, the Record of Rights fee was to be levied in full for one *hisse* in cases where a man owned more than one *hisse* in a survey number and half the fee for the remaining *hisses*. He prayed that the demand be fixed by the authorities themselves, in accordance with those orders, and that the presentation of stamped petitions from the *hissedars* be not insisted upon for giving that relief.

MR. K. RAMANNA supported the representation. He also brought to notice that the scales of Record of Rights fees were reduced from time to time and at present the fee payable for any *hisse* was only Rs. 1-4-0. But the benefit of the Government Order reducing the fees to their present level was not being given to cases in respect of which preliminary Record of Rights had already been prepared. After all, what mattered was the final Record of Rights, and so long as the work connected therewith was not completed, there was no reason why the benefit of the recent orders should not be given in such cases.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) replied that what mattered really was the preliminary record, and if that work was over in respect of any survey number, the owners had no right to expect the benefit of the order in question. He would however have no objection to consider the question in cases where the demand on account of Record of Rights fees had not yet been settled.

REPRESENTATION No. 15.

Record of Rights mutation fee recovery.

MESSRS. CHIKRAME GOWDA and HIRANYA GOWDA, Kolar Taluk and all the other members of the Kolar District.

MR. CHIKRAME GOWDA represented that after the completion of the final Record of Rights a mutation fee of Re. 0-8-0 and Re. 1-0-0 per survey number was being recovered in respect of mutations and entries of rights such as

mortgage, sale and transfer of *khathes*, etc. While the raiyats were already labouring under great difficulties to pay even the usual assessment and other levies, imposition of these additional charges was causing much hardship. He therefore prayed that they be exempted from paying the charges referred to.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantra-pravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) replied that in all cases of succession by sons to lands owned by their fathers, no fees would be charged. But as regards other kinds of transfers, the collection of fees was quite necessary in view of the expenditure that the Government had to incur on establishments and other items for doing all the duties prescribed by the Record of Rights Regulation.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY brought to notice that the mutation fee was a later fee than the Record of Rights fees. At first sight this fee did not seem to weigh very heavily upon the agriculturists. But he was aware that in some cases the parties had to pay as much as Rs. 40 on account of this one item alone. In connection with land revenue collections, the making of all these entries appeared to be the normal duty of the Revenue Department, and simply because the Government maintained a separate establishment for maintaining the mutation register, more probably as a matter of administrative convenience, there was no reason why the parties should bear any additional burden on that account.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that the difficulty complained of did not seem to be so general. He also reminded the member that the Government had passed specific orders to the effect that the maximum amount leviable by way of mutation fees in any one case was to be only Rs. 5.

MR. T. MARIAPPA suggested that mutation fees ought not to be collected at all in the case of transfers of entire survey numbers, as the entries relating to entire numbers did not involve any large amount of work on the part of the survey establishment.

MR. K. MATTHAN promised to consider the suggestion.

REPRESENTATION No. 16.

Reduction of *phod* fee in connection with the Record of Rights work in Nanjangud Taluk.

MESSRS. H. K. MADIHAH and M. K. SUBBIAH, Malvalli Taluk; SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH, Mysore Taluk; T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA, Nagamangala Taluk; S. K. SIDDE GOWDA, S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA, Krishnarajpet Taluk; C. DASAPPA, Heggadevanakote Taluk; GURUBASAPPA, Chamarajanagar Taluk; MIR-RAZA ALI, Minorities; B. S. PUTTASWAMI, Nanjangud Taluk; H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA, T. Narsipur Taluk; H. HONNAYYA and M. L. LINGANNA, Mandya Taluk; PATEL SANNA MALLAPPA, Yelandur Jahgir; K. KEMPE GOWDA, Mandya Municipality; A. THAMMAYYA, Minorities; B. SIDDALINGA SETTY, Special Interests and S. C. MALLIAH, Maddur Taluk.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMI prayed that in connection with the Record of Rights work in progress in Nanjangud Taluk the *phod* fee of Rs. 2 now being recovered be reduced to Rs. 1-4-0 as per rules. He observed that Government were not going to incur any loss by acceding to the representation, because they had already agreed in the past that, over and above the expenditure so far incurred on account of Record of Rights operations, a sum of Rs. 2 lakhs had been received by them and that that sum would be available for meeting the cost of future operations.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantra-pravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) replied that the speaker did not appear to have understood the position correctly. What the Government had stated was merely that, up to the date on which that statement was made, the receipts had been more than the expenditure incurred till then, to the extent stated, and not that Rs. 2 lakhs represented the profit made by the Government after incurring all the necessary expenditure on account of Record of Rights operations. The reduction of fees promised then naturally had reference to operations undertaken subsequent to that date, but the surplus referred to could not be utilised for expenditure on account of future operations, because the work connected with the earlier operations had not been completed altogether.

THE SECOND MEMBER (*Rajamantra-pravina S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI*) added that in Nanjangud Taluk, the *phod* fee had already been collected at the rate of

Rs. 2 from some parties and that it would not be fair to them to collect at Rs. 1-4-0 from others.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMI considered that this was no argument for continuing the levy of a heavy rate, knowing full well that much less than that would be quite enough to meet the cost of the operations. In the next place, because the fee was levied at the high rate of Rs. 2, a good many of the landlords had been unable to pay it and the Government had agreed to postpone its collection. If the Government agreed to reduce the fee to Rs. 1-4-0, the landlords would willingly pay it up immediately and the Government also would benefit from the increased revenue in the near future.

THE DEWAN replied that it was not possible to accede to the request, as it would most probably land the administration into difficulties later on.

The House then adjourned for lunch and reassembled at 3-35 p.m.

REPRESENTATION No. 17.

Usufruct of avenue trees.

MESSRS. PATEL PATTI BASAPPA and KAMAREDDI MALLAPPA, Molakalmuru Taluk.

MR. PATTI BASAPPA prayed that the sale of the usufruct of the avenue trees on the Salem-Bellary Road, that was being held annually, be stopped and the raiyats permitted to enjoy the fruits of the said trees, free.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur* K. MATTHAN) replied that the suggestion would be accepted if the raiyats concerned were able to prove their *hak*.

MR. L. VEMA REDDY said that it would be difficult to prove *hak* even though the raiyats were in enjoyment of the usufruct from time immemorial. Instead of the Government asking the raiyats to prove their *hak*, it would be well to consider how the Government got it. As a matter of fact, in several cases, even the roads were laid out by the villagers and then made over to the Public Works Department for maintenance. The avenues also were planted by the villagers but they were unable in most cases to prove their *hak*.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that it would not be correct to say that in all cases avenues were planted only by the villagers and that the Government had nothing whatever to do with any of them.

MR. BAGAMANE DEVA GOWDA said that, generally speaking, the villagers themselves had planted the avenues. If the Government stepped in now and claimed the usufruct, then, they would also have to take up the responsibility of planting trees in all cases where trees dried up. If the long-standing *mamool* was allowed, on the other hand, the raiyats themselves would have to perform that duty and the Government would be relieved of the burden.

A large number of members rose and agitated for an announcement from Government that the usufruct of avenue trees would no longer be auctioned except in particular cases where Government themselves had actually planted and reared them up.

MR. K. MATTHAN said that, to the extent possible, the Revenue Commissioner would investigate and give suitable orders in cases where special hardship was brought to notice.

MR. M. SUBBAIYA at this stage expressed himself in opposition to the Government surrendering their right in favour of persons who in most cases were arrogating to themselves the ownership of avenue trees without having any real title thereto. It was but just that the Government got the full benefits of auctioning the usufruct unless in particular instances private claimants established their title.

Almost all the members were opposed to this view and insisted on Government withdrawing their claim to avenue trees in general.

MR. B. L. BYANNA added that in cases where Government were unable to convince themselves of their ownership of the trees in question with reference to available records, the presumption must be that the raiyats claiming them were the rightful owners.

MR. K. MATTHAN repeated that if cases of hardship were brought to the notice of the Revenue Commissioner, he would pass suitable orders.

REPRESENTATION No. 18.

Equalising the rates of *potgi* payable to Patels and Shanbhogues.

MR. PATEL HALAPPA, Shimoga Taluk.

MR. PATEL HALAPPA prayed that the percentage of *potgi* payable to patels and shanbhogues be equalised. He added that patels were sharing the brunt of the burden of village administration and that shanbhogues merely helped them on the clerical side. Besides, the patels had to answer various calls from visitors as well as officers of various departments visiting the villages. Such being the case, there was no justification in paying the patels anything less than the shanbhogues. But he would be content if they were given at least as much as the *potgi* allowed to shanbhogues.

MR. B. L. BYANNA observed that the patels had to incur expenditure very frequently on account of the visits of inspecting officers and deserved substantial increases to their *potgies*.

MR. M. S. PUTTARAMASETTI considered that patels were the chief officers of their villages, having to discharge duties of various types. The shanbhogues on the other hand merely maintained the *khirdi* account, and even the responsibility of collections and safe remittance to the treasury rested with the patels. So, it was unjust to pay more to shanbhogues and less to patels. But this was not the only iniquitous feature of the position. Shanbhogues enjoyed the benefit of extensive inam lands in all cases and the lands themselves were the best of all available lands in the villages concerned. The patels, however, rarely enjoyed this privilege. In these circumstances, he suggested not only that the *potgi* should be equalised as prayed for, but also that inam lands should be granted to patels in all cases.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) stated that the basis of *potgi* to patels and shanbhogues was 3 per cent and 5 per cent, respectively, of the land revenue demand. The total expenditure incurred at present under this head was Rs. 10½ lakhs. If the percentage was to be raised to 5 in the case of patels also, Government would have to incur

an additional expenditure of Rs. 2½ lakhs.

MR. PUTTARAMASETTI suggested that, in that case, the total expenditure incurred at present might be re-adjusted in equal proportions.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that it was not possible to accept that suggestion as it amounted to saying that the *potgi* that was being drawn by shanbhogues for a long time past should be reduced in order that patels might be benefited. At the same time, he wanted the House to remember that the *potgi* given to patels was never intended to be in the nature of a salary for services rendered. It was something like an honorarium. The patels would not be materially benefited even if their *potgi* was raised to the level of the *potgi* of the shanbhogues. The expenditure would be very much more than at present and the *potgi* would still remain too inadequate if regarded as wages for the work of patels.

MR. M. VEERARAJ URS said that he was very much satisfied with the spirit of the reply of Government. But he would like Government to make sure that their officers also shared their view about the honorary nature of patels' services. In this connection, he brought to notice that Sub-Division Officers and Amildars were treating patels like servants, and particularly in the collection season when patels went to the taluk treasuries for making remittances, it would be a most distressing scene to find the Amildars taking patels to task and calling them names. If the Amildars believed that patels were honorary workers, they would certainly use respectful language with regard to patels and think twice before levying the heavy fines which they were at present levying.

MR. HALAPPA said that patels would be quite satisfied if the payments made to shanbhogues were called salaries so that some sort of distinction might be maintained as between the two sets of village officers.

THE DEWAN regretted that it was not possible for the Government to do anything with regard to this representation.

MR. K. CHENGALARAYA REDDY at this stage reminded the President of a suggestion which he had made at a previous session of the House to the effect that the President be pleased to conduct the proceedings of the House in a perfectly business-like way and that in case he decided strictly to enforce the rules of business, he and every other member of the Assembly would willingly obey his rulings and co-operate with the Government in enabling the House to transact business in a much more satisfactory way. Sometimes, at present, a number of members were allowed to stand together, to speak simultaneously and to shout out, all to no purpose. This, he said, was a thing which would not add to the reputation of such an important constitutional Assembly; and it would please the Assembly members very much if the President decided strictly to follow the rules, in the interests of the business of the House.

MR. S. K. VENKATARAMA IYENGAR endorsed the above opinion.

THE DEWAN said that the House would do well to proceed with the business in strict accordance with the rules and that it would be well if the members themselves bore this in mind instead of putting the President to the necessity of enforcing the rules. After all, more business could be transacted and better results achieved if members discussed matters in an orderly manner and spoke to the point and as briefly as possible.

REPRESENTATION No. 20.

Recovery of special fine at a reduced rate of 25 years' assessment in respect of agricultural lands proposed to be converted for non-agricultural purposes.

MESSRS. B. L. BYANNA, Bangalore City Municipality; S. MUNIVENKATAPPA, Minorities; B. M. MUNISAMAPPA, Bangalore Taluk; T. MADIAH GOWDA, Channarayana Taluk; R. DASAPPA, Devanahalli Taluk; A. M. VENKATASAMIAH, Closepet Municipality; H. GANGAPPA, Magadi Taluk; SHROFF RANGASAMI SETTY, Magadi Municipality; V. VENKATAPPA, Channarayana Taluk; VEERE GOWDA, Doddaballapur Taluk; S. KARIAPPA and M. DINGE GOWDA, Kankanhalli Taluk; GURUSWAMI GOWDA, Hoskote Taluk; M. B. GURULINGIAH, Closepet Taluk; S. T. MALLASETTAPPA, Nelamangala Taluk and M. S. PUTTARAMASETTI, Magadi Taluk.

MR. B. L. BYANNA represented that whenever a landlord or owner of a land

desired to convert his agricultural land into building sites, the revenue authorities had not only been levying special fine exorbitantly but also recovering 25 years' land assessment which was unusual, unjust and extraordinary in view of the existing depression. He therefore prayed that either the former at a reduced rate or the latter might be ordered to be collected.

He added that the rates of special fine leviable in Bangalore City had been fixed very high taking into account the proximity of the lands in question to the railway station and other facilities, and it would be unjust to collect such heavy rates of fine and also levy 25 years' assessment in addition. Recently, he had taken up a case pertaining to himself before the Revenue Commissioner in appeal and that officer had given a decision in his favour. It was not possible for each party to go in appeal and it would be in the general interests of the public if the principle governing the decision of the Revenue Commissioner was made known to all authorities concerned.

MR. G. KANCHAPPA brought to notice that it was very necessary to issue general instructions in the matter. Because, even in cases where only 25 years' assessment was leviable, the local officers were insisting on payment of double that amount in addition to special fine.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantra-pravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) replied that in all cases where agricultural land was converted for non-agricultural purposes without obtaining previous permission, the rules required that the amount leviable was 50 years' assessment. In cases, however, in which such permission was obtained, only 25 years' assessment would be levied. But the special fine was a different item, leviable on account of nearness to railway stations and so on. If rules in this behalf were not followed by local officers in particular cases, they might be brought to notice.

REPRESENTATION No. 21.

Establishment of a treasury at Periyapatna,

MESSRS. H. K. MADIAH and M. K. SUBBIAH Malvalli Taluk; SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH, Mysore Taluk; T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA, Nagamangala Taluk; S. K. SIDDE GOWDA, S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA, Krishnarajpet Taluk; C. DASAPPA, Heggadadevankote Taluk; GURUBASAPPA, Chamarajanagar Taluk; MIR RAZA ALI, Minorities; B. S. PUTTASWAMI, Nanjangud Taluk; H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS, and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA, T. Narsipur Taluk; H. HONNAIYA and M. L. LINGANNA, Mandya Taluk; PATEL SANNAMALLAPPA, Yelandur Jahgir; K. KEMPE GOWDA, Mandya Municipality; A. THAMMAYYA, Minorities; B. SIDDALINGA SETTY, Special Interests and S. C. MALLIAH, Maddur Taluk.

MR. H. K. MADIAH represented that the people of the Periyapatna sub-taluk experienced great hardship when the taluk office was transferred from Periyapatna to Hunsur. It was commendable that the benign Government since acceded to the representation of the people and constituted Periyapatna into a sub-taluk. People living in remote villages had to travel 34 to 35 miles at considerable risk in forest areas for taking *irsals*, etc., to the treasury at Hunsur. Moreover, the Coorg European Hunting Club would be hunting very near this place every week for 8 or 9 months in the year and races were also held. As much difficulty was experienced for want of a treasury, he prayed that a treasury be established at Periyapatna.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantra-pravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) promised to consider the matter.

REPRESENTATION No. 22.

Land revenue concessions in Yelandur Jahgir Taluk.

MESSRS. H. K. MADIAH and M. K. SUBBIAH, Malvalli Taluk; SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH, Mysore Taluk; T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA, Nagamangala Taluk; S. K. SIDDE GOWDA, S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA, Krishnarajpet Taluk; C. DASAPPA, Heggadadevankote Taluk; GURUBASAPPA, Chamarajanagar Taluk; MIR RAZA ALI, Minorities; B. S. PUTTASWAMI, Nanjangud Taluk; H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA, T. Narsipur Taluk; H. HONNAIYA and M. L. LINGANNA, Mandya Taluk; PATEL SANNAMALLAPPA, Yelandur Jahgir; K. KEMPE GOWDA, Mandya Municipality; A. THAMMAYYA, Minorities; B. SIDDALINGA SETTY, Special Interests and S. C. MALLIAH, Maddur Taluk.

MR. H. K. MADIAH represented that owing to the disrepair of tanks and channels in Yelandur Jahgir and want of rains and

consequent failure of crops, the raiyats of the Jahgir Taluk were unable to pay the Government dues and maintain themselves. They had become indebted and were experiencing much hardship. Many of the lands had been sold for arrears of revenue and resumed to the *Jahgir* and sales had been confirmed. The raiyats had also been prevented from entering upon their lands. It was therefore prayed that the sales held be ordered to be cancelled, and the *kandayam* reduced as much as possible and the number of instalments increased for the payment of this reduced *kandayam*, the distraint of cattle for recovery of arrears from the raiyats being stayed.

THE DEWAN replied that it was not practicable to grant the request.

REPRESENTATION No. 23.

Creating facilities to growers of sugar-cane in taluks other than Maniyya:

MESSRS. H. K. MADIAH and M. K. SUBBIAH, Malvalli Taluk; SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH, Mysore Taluk; T. M. KAPANAYYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA, Nagamangala Taluk; S. K. SIDDE GOWDA, S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA, Krishnarajpet Taluk; C. DASAPPA, Heggadadevankote Taluk; GURUBASAPPA, Chamarajanagar Taluk; MIR RAZA ALI, Minorities; B. S. PUTTASWAMI, Nanjangud Taluk; H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA, T. Narsipur Taluk; H. HONNAIYA and M. L. LINGANNA, Mandya Taluk; PATEL SANNAMALLAPPA, Yelandur Jahgir; K. KEMPE GOWDA, Mandya Municipality; A. THAMMAYYA, Minorities; B. SIDDALINGA SETTY, Special Interests and S. C. MALLIAH, Maddur Taluk.

MR. H. HOMBE GOWDA represented that the encouragement shown and facilities provided to the sugar-cane-growers in the villages of the Mandya Taluk were not being extended to their brethren in the villages of their neighbouring taluks in respect of supply of cane to the Sugar Factory. This sort of treatment had damped the enthusiasm of the present and prospective growers of cane. In spite of the assurance given by Government at the Budget Session of 1934, it was found, on enquiry and by actual experience, that the encouragement shown to growers of sugar-cane and the interest evinced by the factory in obtaining the supply of cane from the raiyats in the Mandya Taluk were not being extended to the cane-growers in other adjoining taluks. As

these raiyats would be discouraged if they were not given the same encouragement and facilities as in Mandya Taluk, he prayed that arrangements be made to extend the same treatment to the raiyats of the neighbouring taluks also.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER (MR. N. MADHAVA RAO) replied that so long as sugar-cane growers who had obtained seedlings from the factory and had entered into agreements with it were able to supply all the quantities required by the factory, it would not be necessary to accept supplies from others. But in cases where supplies from such growers fell short of the requirements of the factory, there would be no objection to encouraging those from outside the Irwin Canal area. As regards Bannur, Krishnarajanagar and other places, he said it might be difficult for cane-growers there to undertake to make supplies from those parts to the factory at Mandya, because the factory insisted that all cane should be delivered at the factory within 24 hours after it was cut, and growers at distant places might find it difficult to fulfil that requirement. Secondly, there were so many kinds of canes and the factory naturally paid different prices for them. The suppliers from distant places might not get the best possible prices because their supply might not happen to be the best. These were some of the difficulties that stood in the way of the factory accepting supplies from distant growers to any large extent.

MR. PATEL SIDDE GOWDA said that cane-growers from the Bannur area were prepared to accept all the conditions prescribed by the factory. During the current year particularly, they had been hit very hard and it would be a great help if the factory accepted supplies from them. And in order that they might not have to lose similarly in years to come, they were anxious that the factory should accept supplies from that area.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) reminded the member that recently the block system of irrigation had been brought into effect in Bannur and that it might not be possible for cane-

growers there to undertake to make regular supplies to the factory since the area under sugar-cane would necessarily be much less than before.

MR. SIDDE GOWDA said that they were prepared to undertake the responsibility notwithstanding the block system.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that, in that case, the factory would consider how far they could comply with the request of the cane-growers concerned.

REPRESENTATION No. 24.

Nomination of non-official gentlemen to the Krishnarajasagara Working Committee and the sub-committee to represent the raiyats of Mandya Taluk.

MESSRS. H. K. MADIHA, and M. K. SUBBIAH, Malvalli Taluk; SIVANANJE GOWDA and SAVANDIAH, Mysore Taluk; T. M. KAPANNAYA GOWDA and K. M. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA, Nagamangala Taluk; S. K. SIDDE GOWDA, and S. THIMME GOWDA *alias* THAMMAYYA GOWDA and A. LINGE GOWDA, Krishnarajapet Taluk; C. DASAPPA, Heggadadevanakote Taluk; GURUBASAPPA, Chamarajanagar Taluk; MIR RAZA ALI, Minorities; B. S. PUTTASWAMI, Nanjangud Taluk; H. HOMBE GOWDA, N. VEERARAJ URS and PATEL SIDDE GOWDA, T. Narsipur Taluk; H. HONNAIYA, and M. L. LINGANNA, Mandya Taluk; PATEL SANNAMALLAPPA, Yelandur Jahgir; K. KEMPE GOWDA, Mandya Municipality; A. THAMMAYYA, Minorities; B. SIDDALINGA SETTY, Special Interests and S. C. MALLIAH, Maddur Taluk.

As large extents of land in the Mandya Taluk had come under cultivation under the Irwin Canal, it was prayed that non-official gentlemen be nominated to the Krishnarajasagara Working Committee and the Sub-committee to represent to Government the grievances of the raiyats of this taluk.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) replied that the system of nominating non-official members to the committee was already in vogue.

MR. M. K. SUBBIAH brought to notice that the system was not working satisfactorily as members not owning any lands at all under the Irwin Canal were sometimes being nominated.

MR. K. MATTHAN replied that the system would be improved in the future.

REPRESENTATION No. 90.

Construction of a road to Sri Narasimhaswami Temple at Savandurga in Madabai Hobli, Magadi Taluk.

MESSRS. SHROFF RANGASAMI SETTY, Magadi Municipality; T. MADIAH GOWDA, Channapatna Taluk; R. DASAPPA, Devanhalli Taluk; A. M. VENKATASAMIAH, Closepet Municipality; H. GANGAPPA, Magadi Taluk; V. VENKATAPPA, Channapatna Taluk; VEERE GOWDA, Dojballapur Taluk; S. KARIAPPA and M. LINGE GOWDA, Kankanhalli Taluk; GURUSWAMI GOWDA, Hoskote Taluk; M. B. GURULINGIAH, Closepet Taluk; S. T. MALLASETTAPPA, Nelamangala Taluk and M. S. PUTTARAMASETTI, Magadi Taluk.

MR. SHROFF RANGASAMI SETTY represented that the temple of Sri Narasimhaswami at Savandurga in Madabal Hobli, Magadi Taluk, was a famous one and many devotees were visiting the temple from far and distant places. At present, there was no road to the temple and much inconvenience was caused to both men and cattle to move about and to the devotees to visit the temple. He therefore prayed that a road be caused to be constructed to the said temple.

He added that, 10 or 12 years ago, when His Highness the Maharaja visited the temple, he was pleased to observe that a well-laid out road was very necessary and that Government would provide sufficient funds for the purpose.

MR. PUTTARAMASETTI stated that the temple was a very ancient institution and that Magadi Taluk being connected with Kempe Gowda's name had great historic importance. From the point of health and sanitation also, Savandurga was better than the Nandi Hills, and good roads as well as electric lights to the temple in question were necessary, to give the place the popularity which it deserved.

MR. J. MAHOMED IMAM observed that, if the place was of an all-Mysore importance, the work referred to might be taken up at the cost of State funds.

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (*Diwan Bahadur N. N. AYYANGAR*) stated that it was estimated that for a length of 2½ miles, the road would cost Rs. 11,600. Government agreed that it was a necessary item of work and they would have sanctioned it if the Forest Department had agreed to bear one-third of the cost as suggested by Government, in addition to the two-thirds which the District Board and the Muzrai Department had already agreed to contribute. The matter, however, was under correspon-

dence with the Forest Department and if that department agreed to bear their quota of expenditure, Government hoped to go ahead with the work.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA said that the temple had large funds at its credit and might perhaps bear a portion of the expenditure.

THE DEWAN stated that Government would sanction the road, the expenditure being debited in equal proportions to the District Board, the temple and the General Muzrai Fund.

REPRESENTATION NO. 91.

Restoration of and repairs to tanks which have silted up.

MESSRS. B. L. BYANNA, Bangalore City Municipality; S. MUNIVENKATAPPA, Minorities; B. M. MUNISAMAPPA, Bangalore Taluk; T. MADIAH GOWDA, Channapatna Taluk; R. DASAPPA, Devanhalli Taluk; A. M. VENKATASAMIAH, Closepet Municipality; H. GANGAPPA, Magadi Taluk; SHROFF RANGASAMI SETTY, Magadi Municipality; V. VENKATAPPA, Channapatna Taluk; VEERE GOWDA, Dojballapur Taluk; S. KARIAPPA and M. LINGE GOWDA, Kankanhalli Taluk; GURUSWAMI GOWDA, Hoskote Taluk; M. B. GURULINGIAH, Closepet Taluk; S. T. MALLASETTAPPA, Nelamangala Taluk and M. S. PUTTARAMASETTI, Magadi Taluk.

MR. B. L. BYANNA represented that many tanks had been silted up and their capacity decreased. In some of the tanks there would be no water and consequently crops failed year after year. Though the raiyats paid contribution for maintenance, some of the wet lands under such tanks were not being irrigated for a number of years for want of water. He therefore prayed that effective steps be adopted for the speedy restoration of such tanks.

He also prayed that every tank be surveyed at least once in 10 years and the question of adequacy or otherwise of the supply of water to the *atchkat* lands be investigated and steps taken for effecting needful repairs to such of the tanks as did not retain sufficient water so that all the lands included in their *atchkat* might get adequate supply of water.

MR. H. M. CHENNABASAPPA said that particularly in Hunsur Taluk and Periyapatna sub-taluk, though the tanks received supplies whenever rainfall was satisfactory, they were not of use to the cultivators since their capacity had been reduced due to silting up.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA said that the question of silt clearance and the need for a decennial tank survey had been coming up time after time and that Government had once promised to investigate how far the storage capacity of tanks had decreased and to what extent lands would have to be taken out of *atchkats* in the case of such tanks. If action on the lines promised was taken and *atchkats* reduced where necessary, many raiyats would be enabled to derive some benefit by growing dry crops instead of losing heavily by trying to grow wet crops.

MR. BELUR SRINIVASIENGAR traced the progress made with regard to tank restoration works under various Dewans and observed that, latterly, the policy of restoring tanks on a large scale had not been consistently followed. It was necessary for Government to give their first consideration to tank restoration work under a definite programme.

MR. S. K. VENKATARANGA IYENGAR suggested that such a programme should apply to tanks in inam villages also.

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (*Diwan Bahadur* N. N. AYYANGAR) explained that Government were perfectly aware of the necessity of tank restoration on a large scale in the State. As large an expenditure as was possible was being incurred for the purpose, and anything more to be done in future would naturally have to depend upon the general budget position.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA asked what objection the Government had to undertake a general survey for the purpose of preparing a programme.

MR. N. N. AYYANGAR replied that a general survey would perhaps not be of any immediate use since there were a large number of tanks still requiring to be brought up to standard conditions.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA said that such a survey would at least enable Government to decide in which cases and to what extent lands would have to be taken out of *atchkats*.

MR. N. N. AYYANGAR replied that before any lands were taken out of *atchkats*, it was certainly worth the while of the land-holders to make a

more discreet and economical use of the available quantities of water in each tank. He was aware of instances of tanks receiving plenty of supplies, but all the water was being allowed to go to waste since the sluices were not closed in time.

MR. B. L. BYANNA requested that the Government should definitely undertake to restore at least one thousand tanks every year.

MR. G. CHANNAPPA agreed in the suggestion and said that Government must set apart whatever money was necessary for the purpose every year.

THE DEWAN remarked that Government were doing the best they could even without such a programme.

MR. RANGASAMI SETTY said that in Magadi, for example, the temple had a large sum of money at its credit and there should be no objection to the Government contributing a half of the cost of restoring the tank at that place, finding the other half from the temple funds.

THE SECOND MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina* S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI) enquired whether one or two bore wells would not satisfy the purpose.

MR. RANGASWAMI SETTY represented that every year several thousands of pilgrims visited the temple and had considerable difficulties to face since the tank had not been restored. Besides, the cattle of the place had also no drinking water, and bore wells would not help them in any way.

MR. B. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (Anekal) represented that there was a great disproportion as between the grant made for restoring minor tanks and that for major tanks and suggested that the provision for restoration of minor tanks be materially increased.

THE DEWAN observed that minor tank restoration was mainly a concern of the respective local bodies, the Government having to give their share of the cost only when such bodies undertook to discharge their own responsibility.

MR. S. C. MALLIAH brought to notice that even in cases where local bodies offered to shoulder their share of responsibility, the Government were

not sanctioning schemes because they were not able to contribute their own quota. So long as minor tanks were not restored, Government would have to continue to face the problem of remissions. If all minor tanks were restored, they would no more be bothered by fluctuations in the land revenue budget. From this point of view it was necessary to restore as many tanks as possible every year.

MR. ABDUL KHALEEL SAHIB supported the above view.

THE FIRST MEMBER (*Rajamantrapravina Diwan Bahadur K. MATTHAN*) explained that the expenditure on minor tank restoration in former years stood at about Rs. 40,000; but recently, the Government spent as much as Rs. 1,25,000 on that item, apart from Rs. 40,000 given for special repairs. And this, again, was in addition to original major works that had been undertaken so far at a cost of Rs. 1,36,000. With regard to minor tank restoration, in Bangalore District alone, for example, he said that the original budget estimates for the current year had provided only Rs. 10,000, against which the revised estimates showed a provision of Rs. 39,000. This showed that the Government were prepared to incur as large an expenditure on minor tank restoration as possible.

Khan Bahadur MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN observed that a few decades ago, it was not possible to know how much expenditure was incurred on minor tank restoration as distinct from major tank restoration. Recently, Government had attached great importance to the restoration of minor tanks and begun to show a separate provision for the purpose in the budget. In recent years, the Government were spending as much as a lakh of rupees on this item, and during the budget year they proposed to spend Rs. 1½ lakhs. But even that would not be enough and he would request that an additional allotment of one lakh of rupees be made for the restoration of minor tanks.

THE DEWAN replied that Government were doing and would continue to do their best in regard to tank restoration work.

REPRESENTATION No. 92.

Construction of Jalladagundi Tank.

MESSRS. PATEL PATTI BASAPPA and KAMAREDDI MALLAPPA, Molakalmuru Taluk.

MR. PATEL PATTI BASAPPA represented that the raiyats had been requesting for a very long time for the construction of Jalladagundi tank. After some correspondence on the subject and even after taking *mutchalikas* from the raiyats for payment of contribution, the work was not taken up for some reason or other. As during the present economic depression, poor people were undergoing great hardship for want of any means of livelihood and as the execution of the work now would be very helpful both to the Government and to the raiyats besides providing work for the labouring classes, he prayed that the work be taken on hand very early.

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (*Diwan Bahadur N. N. AYYANGAR*) explained that this project had been under consideration for a long time past. The project provided for a capacity of 333 units, irrigating 506 acres of land. The estimated cost was Rs. 2,21,500. The net assessment that might be expected from the lands under the tank was about Rs. 3,987. Apart from the contribution of Rs. 88,550 promised by the local raiyats, Government would have to incur an expenditure of Rs. 1,32,950 on the scheme. This would work out at a net revenue return of 3 per cent which was considered very inadequate. In these circumstances, he said that the project could not be taken up.

REPRESENTATION No. 94.

Construction of a feeder channel to Boranakani from Gantihalli.

MESSRS. C. PATTABHIRAMA SETTY, Chiknaikanahalli Municipality; G. KANCHAPPA and MUHAMMADI H. C. VEERABHADRAPPA, Chiknaikanahalli Taluk.

MR. C. PATTABHIRAMA SETTY represented that Chiknaikanahalli Taluk was in distress in two ways in that there were no timely rains and that the price of cocoanuts and, *copra*, whose yield was but little, had fallen down considerably to the extent of less than half the usual rates. Government had-

not hitherto taken up any relief works in that taluk. He prayed that the construction of a feeder channel to Boranakanive from Gantihalli be taken up as a relief work to provide labour to the raiyats in the vicinity of this village which was particularly suffering from distress, and that provision be made in the current year's budget for this work.

MR. M. S. PUTTARAMASETTI supported the representation and added that in order to safeguard the interests of Government it was necessary to appoint a local committee in the case of each tank.

THE DEWAN replied that the Chief Engineer would note this suggestion. As regards the main representation, he said that the scheme was estimated to cost something like Rs 2,50,000.

MR. H. C. VEERABHADRAPPA represented that it would be worth while incurring that expenditure since many people of the surrounding areas were eager to own lands there, if the feeder channel was constructed.

THE DEWAN remarked that the work was not so very urgent and that even the lands already available under the Boranakanive reservoir had not fully been brought under cultivation.

MR. PUTTARAMASETTI represented that that would not be the case if the feeder channel was constructed.

THE DEWAN replied that the Chief Engineer would be requested to re-examine the estimates.

The Assembly then rose for the day to meet again at 12 of the clock on Wednesday, 19th June 1935.

SIXTH DAY.

Wednesday, 19th June 1935.

The House reassembled at 12 of the clock.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS— (concl'd.)

*Amendment of the
Workmen's Compensation Regulation.*
MR. T. RAMACHANDRA (Labour Interests).—

Q.—53. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) From what year is the Workmen's Compensation Regulation in force in the State?

(b) Has the Regulation been amended since; if so, how many times and when?

(c) Has it come to the notice of the Government that the Workmen's Compensation Act in British India has been amended several times between the years 1923 and 1933 and enlarged from time to time in scope and application; if so, have the Government contemplated similar amendments and enlargements in the Regulation in force in the State; if so, when will such amendments come into force?

(d) (1) How many applications for workmen's compensation were received by the Labour Commissioner in Mysore during the past five years?

(2) How many of them were for (i) partial disablement, (ii) total disablement, and (iii) death?

(3) What amounts were disbursed under each of the above three heads, during the past five years? (The information may kindly be given year-war.)

THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA).—

A.—(a) The Workmen's Compensation Regulation has been in force from the 1st January 1929.

(b) No.

(c) Yes. The question of amending the Mysore Regulation so as to bring it into conformity with the Indian Act is under the consideration of Government.

(d) The statistics called for are shown in the enclosed statement and relate to Bangalore City only (*vide* Appendix).

MR. T. RAMACHANDRA.—How many officers are there to administer the Workmen's Compensation Regulation in the State?

MR. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Nine: the Deputy Commissioners in the Districts and the Director of Industries and Commerce in the Bangalore City.

MR. T. RAMACHANDRA.—Do the benefits of the Regulation apply also to